DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 701 IR 053 024

AUTHOR Disbrow, Nancy; Huwiler, Paul
TITLE Multi Image in Library Instruction. Research Bulletin No. 3, Spring 1986.
INSTITUTION Southern Connecticut State Univ., New Haven.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 4p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; Comparative Analysis; Experimental Teaching; Faculty Publishing; Higher Education; Instructional Effectiveness; Instructional Innovation; *Intermode Differences; *Lecture Method; *Librarians; *Library Instruction; *Multimedia Instruction; *Slides; Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Librarian Attitudes

ABSTRACT

An alternative method for teaching a three-credit, undergraduate library instruction course for students other than library science majors was explored at Southern Connecticut State University. It was believed that traditional methods of instruction--e.g., lecturing in libraries and using paper handouts--were colorless, failed to engage students, and served to perpetuate the stereotype of the dull librarian. On the other hand, it was theorized that the multi image method (e.g., the use of two or more image projectors) would be able to deliver large amnounts of information in a very short time with high retention rates. It was felt that strong presentation systems could be created if the multi image system were well planned and executed. To compare the multi image method of instruction with traditional teaching methods, a library instruction course was divided into two sections: one was taught by a professor who delivered the material through lectures (and had always received good to excellent student evaluations), and the other used only multi image instruction. The two sections were given the same examinations and had the same overall course objectives. It was found that the experimental group performed better on tests, appeared to exhibit better retention, and responded to the technique favorably. (SD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

School of Library Science and Instructional Technology

501 Crescent St.
New Haven, CT 06515
(203) 397-4530

No. 3, Spring, 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E.Prostano

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 322701

The RESEARCH BULLETIN is an occasional publication. Its purpose is to provide summaries of research, conducted by School faculty and others, of general interest to the professional community.

MULTI IMAGE IN LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

Nancy Disbrow, Assistant Professor, SCSU
Paul Huwiler, Associate Professor, SCSU

Teaching library skills is a delicate and precise art. In fact that may be its greatest problem. When we, as library educators begin to teach others about our discipline, we sometimes speak in a dialect best described as "librarese," illustrate with paper handouts and blackboard diagrams and generally do an excellent job of keeping the vision of the stereotype librarian alive. Were we dealing with an audience that virtually inhaled all the information we set before them, then that teaching style colored in dull, and whispered would allow us to perform without trouble. Unfortunately, students with whom most of us deal don't listen to information distributed in that fashion. To overcome this reluctance, we are required to find ways that counteract "librarese" so that the students learn and understand the legacy of information to which they are heirs as well as the ways in which that legacy can be used to "shoot the spirit on further than target ever showed or shone."

THE CHALLENGE

The School of Library Science and Instructional Technology at Southern Connecticut State University offers undergraduates a three-credit course in utilizing a library. Not open to library science majors, several sections of the course are offered with the majority of students being sophomores and juniors as well as students in the College Achievement Program, a support program for students whose high school records were not exceptional but who have other characteristics that demonstrate the potential to succeed. The cross section of students is therefore like that of any basic library course offered by a college or the program offered by a school media system. Some of the students want to know, some are told to be there, and others are uncommitted to anything except successful completion of the course for whatever reward they foresee. It is as though the entire group lays down a challenge that goes "teach us how a library works, and be quick about it. While you're at it, make it interesting."

Confronted with this challenge and recognizing the capability of the multi image vehicle the authors looked at the challenge and its answer with a high degree of enthusiasm. Multi image has the capability to deliver a great amount of information in a very short amount of time with high retention rates. Because a multi image presentation is lively, it tends to absorb viewers. Utilizing both of these facts could allow a strong presentation system to be created provided the multi image system was well planned and executed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MULTI IMAGE

Defining the vehicle without leaving oneself open to attack is difficult so we will call what follows a description of multi image rather than a definition. Multi image is the use of two or more image projectors and a programming device that turns projector lamps on and off and advances trays. Assume two slide projectors, A and B, loaded with trays each having twenty slides in a tray. A multi image delivery can do the following:

1. Cut in slides from either the A or B tray
2. Fade in an image from either tray

In the first case, the slide will "pop" on the screen at full intensity; in the second, the slide will appear from black at whatever rate the programming machine allows: 1,2,3,4,6,8,16,32 seconds. Assuming that projector A is on and slide 1 is on the screen, we can program a change to the B projector. A number of programming choices are available. We can hard cut, immediate change at full intensity; we can dissolve at the rates above, or we can hold images superimposed over one another. No matter what we do, as soon as the lamp of projector A has gone off and projector B has come on, projector A will advance to its next slide. Multi image is really only a process of turning lights on and off and moving trays at the right time. The efficiency of the delivery system lies in how rapidly the slides are called and what kind of audio track accompanies the slide changes. Using multi image allows information delivery with prompts that may be very obvious or very subtle. A creative teacher using a programmer that has flexibility can use those slow dissolves, superimpositions, blinks, and animation effects to overcome the stereotype of library dull and reference voice.

ANSWERING THE CHALLENGE

One of the authors was responsible for teaching sections of the basic undergraduate library science course. The authors decided to isolate and develop one segment of the course dealing with biographical material into an experimental project. The instructor would deliver the information in a lecture mode to a selected section using whatever style and auxiliary support deemed necessary. An experimental section would receive only a multi image treatment that covered the same subject. To insure that both groups received the same content, both presentations were to be developed from the same objectives. Additionally, both sections would receive identical diagnostic as well as mastery tests. In essence two closely aligned groups in terms of achievement would receive the same block of information with the only difference being the delivery method.

In an effort of this kind, the participants become a very significant variable. To reduce the danger of that variable warping the results the authors sought to identify control and experimental personnel by performance. There was no way to "pull" people to create classes, since this creates the possibility for severe haloing; consequently, the authors matched test scores individually section by section to identify two appropriate sections. The control group of 26 students had a higher individual test average than the experimental group of 22 students.

In developing the treatment strategy, the authors decided that the multi image presentation was to stand alone. The experimental group was to receive no other treatment except a brief introduction to the topics and the presentation. This was matched against a lecture presentation for the control group by an instructor who had always received good to excellent student evaluations.

CONDUCT OF THE EXPERIMENT

Treatment was given to both sections with the same alignment of objectives. The common elements in both systems were (1) mutually stated behavioral objectives, (2) testing to determine prior knowledge, (3) testing to determine mastery, (4) work problems, (5) final examination, testing for retention.

The experimental group was tested immediately following the multi image treatment. The tests were collected, and the group immediately received the treatment a second time. They were given the post test a second time and both tests were scored at that time.

The control group received its treatment through the instructor presentation and was tested following the presentation.

At the conclusion of post testing both groups were given exercises in doing biographical searching. Both groups took a final examination four weeks later that included a section on biographical searching.

OUTCOMES

For the experimental group, almost one third achieved a B or better on the test administered after the first treatment. After a second treatment better than two thirds of the group achieved a test score that was B or better. Total treatment time for the experimental group was shortly over 13 minutes.

The control group did not fare as well despite the fact that they were given a treatment time that was three times the length of the experimental group. The control group also had opportunity to ask questions throughout the treatment, something that was not available to the experimental group.

Aside from the better scores there was also the fact that those students who were in the experimental section displayed better scores on the biography section of the final exam. The exam occurred some four weeks later, indicating that multi image may be effective in developing retention ability. The authors do not claim that fact to be true in this case, since the practical work done by the students also aided retention. The authors believe that the better understanding of process demonstrated by higher post test scores of the experimental group lead to more facility in working the problems which then lead to better retention.

In addition to apparent longer retention, the student reaction to the multi image presentation was interesting. Since the instructor spent no time discussing the technique, the students were not anticipating the presentation. Student response at the end was gratifying. "That was really good. What I liked best was that it moved. It didn't just stand there. It was good." That enthusiasm was shared by all who saw the presentation. It may be that the multi image medium can be a way to change attitudes about subject material.

OTHER IMPLICATIONS AND IDEAS

The authors are in the process of developing more material for not only the basic undergraduate course, but other library science courses as well, and it may be that this program will be transferred to video for use in study carrels. Based on the results of this experiment, they feel that other material will be equally useful; however, there are questions that need to be examined:

1. What is saturation in this medium, or does it not exist?
2. If programs are made for carrel use, does the change in image size cause a loss of impact?
3. How important are special effect slides such as neons, glows, splits, used for cuing and identification?

These are topics that the authors will pursue. They hope that others will be inclined to try similar experiments to aid in the improvement of instruction.

The Research Group
E. Prostano, Chair